

## REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of January 3, 2008, claims 1-3, 7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,545,653 B1 (hereinafter "Takahara et al."). In addition, claims 8 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takahara et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,253,091 (hereinafter "Kimura et al."). Furthermore, claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takahara et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,806,862 B1 (hereinafter "Zhang et al.").

In response, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1 and 11 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference of Takahara et al. As amended, the independent claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Takahara et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the independent claims 1 and 11, as well as their dependent claims 2, 3, 7-10 and 12-17, be allowed.

### A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1 and 11

The amended independent claim 1 recites in part "*some of the control lines being connected to a plurality of delay units such that only every other control line is connected to a particular delay unit of the delay units and each of remaining control lines is not connected to any delay unit,*" which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Takahara et al. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Takahara et al.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The cited reference of Takahara et al. discloses a plurality of D flip-flops 94 in a gate driver 38, which is shown in Fig. 4, connected to the odd-numbered gate lines, e.g., gate lines  $x_1$  and  $x_3$ . However, Fig. 4 of Takahara et al. shows only one of the

two gate drivers 38a and 38b. As described in column 11, lines 46-52, of Takahara et al., the gate drivers 38a and 38b “are identical on arrangement and function to each other” but “the first gate driver 38a is connected to odd-numbered gate lines of the LCD panel 81” and “the second gate driver 38b is connected to even-numbered gate lines of the LCD panel 81.” Thus, if the gate driver shown in Fig. 4 of Takahara et al. is the first gate driver 38a, the D flip-flops 94 are connected to the odd-numbered gate lines. However, the even-numbered gate lines would be connected to similar D flip-flops of the second gate driver 38b. Thus, every gate line is connected to a D flip-flop. Consequently, the cited reference of Takahara et al. does not disclose the limitation of “*some of the control lines being connected to a plurality of delay units such that only every other control line is connected to a particular delay unit of the delay units and each of remaining control lines is not connected to any delay unit,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Consequently, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Takahara et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claim 11, which recites similar limitations as the amended independent claim 1 with respect to data lines. Consequently, the amended independent claim 11 is also not anticipated by the cited reference of Takahara et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 11 be allowed as well.

#### B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2, 3, 7-10 and 12-17

Each of the dependent claims 2, 3, 7-10 and 12-17 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1 and 11. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

5

Respectfully submitted,  
Kieschnick et al.

10

Date: April 3, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/  
Thomas H. Ham  
Registration No. 43,654  
Telephone: (925) 249-1300